

REMARKS

The Applicant has filed the present Response in reply to the outstanding Official Action of March 29, 2005, and the Applicant believes the Response to be fully responsive to the Official Action for the reasons set forth below in greater detail.

In the outstanding Official Action, the Examiner rejected Claims 22-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Engellenner, United States Patent No. 5,786,764. Specifically, the Examiner avers that Engellenner discloses an electronic tag for use with an object locator feature of **a security system**.

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the rejection and traverses with at least the following analysis. Applicant submits that the Examiner is misinterpreting the phrase “a security system” as used in the claims with an inventory security and management system that is disclosed by Engellenner. In Engellenner’s abstract, the reference states that methods and apparatus are disclosed for location of objects to facilitate retrieval, filing, security, inventory stock keeping and the like. See abstract. However, the reference does not disclose a “security system”, as disclosed and described in the instant application.

Specifically, the reference teaches that a transmitter and receiver are incorporated into a single wall mounted unit. See Figure 3, Col. 8, lines 17-22. In another embodiment, the system for location objects comprises a controller, a set of interrogating transmitters, and a plurality of receivers. See Figure 1, Col. 7, lines 41-45. The transmitters and receivers are coupled to the controller by transmitter bus 13 and receiver bus 17. Several other embodiments are disclosed; however, one common feature of each embodiment is that special circuitry is required for operation. The reference does disclose or suggest taking advantage of a preexisting wireless security device.

Additionally, while an object locator can be considered as being used for “security”, i.e., knowing where inventory is, it is not a “security system” within the meaning and spirit of the invention.

In contrast, the claimed invention incorporates the location feature into an existing **security system**. The claimed invention claims an object locator feature that can be **integrated into an existing security system**, such as in a home or small business. The claimed security system refers to a security system that is used in a home or a business to deter burglaries and detect fires. The term “security”, thus, encompasses security from intrusion, as well as fire. Other hazards such as carbon monoxide may also be monitored. A security system, as disclosed in an embodiment of the invention, includes a central control panel 110 that communicates with a number of sensors via a wired or wireless path. The security system further includes a user interface device 140 that may be the primary interface between the human user and the security system 100. The user interface device 140 is commonly provided as a wireless device to allow it to be permanently installed in the home without running wire, such as by affixing it to a wall.

The security system implements wireless components that can transmit and/or receive wireless signals. The user interface device 140 may have both transmit and receive capabilities to communicate with the control panel 110.

Each wireless component of the security system must be “learned” by the control 114. In the learning process, data is stored in the non-volatile memory 115 that identifies the characteristics of each sensor, including the sensor type, serial number or other identifier, and what type of action to take based on signals received from each sensor.

As noted above, the claimed invention incorporates the object locator feature into an existing security system such that the invention can take advantage of the existing wireless network, circuitry, and structure, as mentioned above. That is, existing wireless communication components and transmitting and receiving protocols of the control panel 110 and/or user interface device 140 are used. Accordingly, the only new components that are required are electronic tags that can be attached to objects to be located.

The claimed invention is not an electric tag for general use as an object locator, but an electronic tag for a specific use with an object locator feature of a security system.

Therefore, the reference fails to teach each and every limitation of Claims 22-24 and, thus, Engellenner does not anticipate the claims.

Additionally, the Examiner rejected Claims 1-21 and 25-26 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Engellenner in view of Crabtree et al., United States Patent No. 6,788,199 (hereinafter “Crabtree”).

Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner’s rejection and traverses with at least the following analysis.

Applicant submits that a hypothetical combination of the aforementioned references fails to teach or suggest all of the limitations of independent Claims 1, 11, 16, and 25. Specifically, the references fail to teach (i) security system with an object locator feature, as recited in Claim 1; (ii) a method for providing an object locator feature for a security system, comprising: storing identifiers for electronic tags associated with a plurality of objects, and storing descriptive information for the plurality of objects, in a memory associated with a user interface device of the security system, as recited in Claim 11; (iii) a program storage device, tangibly embodying a program of instructions

executable by a machine to perform a method for providing an object locator feature for a security system, the method comprising the steps of: storing identifiers for electronic tags associated with a plurality of objects, and storing descriptive information for the plurality of objects, in a memory associated with a user interface device of the security system, as recited in Claim 16; and (iv) a security system with an object polling feature, as recited in Claim 25.

Crabtree fails to supply the missing teaching as identified above, i.e., does not teach a “security system” as claimed.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that the independent claims are patentable over the cited references.

As set out above, the combined references do not disclose all the elements of independent Claims 1, 11, 16 and 25. Accordingly, since dependent claims 2-10, 12-15, 17-21 and 26 recite additional unique elements and/or limitations, these claims are patentable over the asserted combinations based upon the above-identified reason.

For all the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the rejections of Claims 22-24 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Furthermore, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw rejections of Claims 1-21 25, and 26 pursuant to 35 U.S.C. § 103(a).

In conclusion, the Applicant believes that the above-identified application is in condition for allowance and henceforth respectfully solicits the Examiner to allow the application. If the Examiner believes a telephone conference might expedite the allowance of this application, the Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner call

the undersigned, Applicant's attorney, at the following telephone number: (516) 742-4343.

Respectfully submitted,



Seth Weinfeld

Registration No: 50,929

Scully, Scott, Murphy & Presser
400 Garden City Plaza, Suite 300
Garden City, New York 11530
(516) 742-4343

SW:ae